

does so publicly. We don't live the most significant aspects of our lives in private. We don't smuggle babies home from the maternity ward. We don't usually elope in dead of night or furtively bury our dead. Why should expressions of belief be different?"

But what of the coercive effect of religion in public places—and particularly in public places for children?

The answer, says Hasson, whose organization has defended religious expression on the part of a huge range of faiths, is "not to blanket this facet of our humanity under a layer of secularism but to let a thousand flowers bloom." That's why he likes the New York City accommodation of Muslim students.

"A public school system that pretends to have a comprehensive education but resolutely says nothing about religion for 12 years is not comprehensive at all. Indeed, it sends a powerful message to our children that religion is at best an optional aspect of their human nature—and in doing so, it lies about who and what we are. When a public school sets aside space for children who wish to pray, it sends the opposite message: that faith is a natural part of life. Levy wasn't pushing Islam; he was sending a message of respect."

But doesn't Levy's action violate the separation clause of the First Amendment? Not as Hasson sees it. The Framers of the amendment never intended to hobble religion, he argues—only to avoid the establishment of a particular religion. "The people who wrote the Bill of Rights hired a congressional chaplain," he said. "A few days after writing his famous letter on the wall of separation, Thomas Jefferson attended Sunday church services in the House of Representatives."

But surely Hasson will acknowledge the Taliban stand as incontrovertible evidence of what happens when true believers take over public places. These fundamentalists are so certain they know the will of God that they see themselves as entitled—indeed as compelled—to root out nonbelievers as the enemies of God. And not all the fundamentalists are Muslims or "over there."

It's a matter to which the lawyer obviously has given some thought. "The religious fundamentalists and the secular fundamentalists make the same mistake," he says. "They separate truth from freedom. For Osama bin Laden, freedom must be sacrificed for the sake of truth. For our secular fundamentalists, any claims of truth must be abandoned in the interest of freedom."

"Both are wrong, and I think a few more people may be starting to see it."

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, now as I begin my closing in the next couple of minutes, let me say to those groups that were opposed to the resolution that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) will be offering legislation that will be binding, if it should pass, and I intend to support him. I know many Members on the floor tonight, including the Speaker pro tempore, as well as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), who will be speaking shortly, will be supporting the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

Mr. Speaker, prior to 1962, we had prayer in this Nation. I think the children of this country, and since September 11, I think there have been more adults in the churches, the synagogues, the mosques, than there have

been in a long, long time. Again, for these groups that are supposed to help educate our children like the National PTA, I was very disappointed that they would oppose a resolution that was only the sense of the Congress. When governors, when the President, when other leaders of State and local and national government are asking people to pray for America and to pray for our men and women in uniform, I just felt like I needed to come to the floor and say "thank you" to those who voted for this resolution on November 15. Again, it passed with 297, only 125 in opposition. They are the kind of messages, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, we need to be sending to the American people, because every survey I have seen over the last 2 years, better than 70 percent of the American people, say they would like to see prayer returned to the school systems of America.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman from Georgia will be speaking shortly and I would like to help him if he would like for me to do so.

Mr. Speaker, let me, if I might, stay on the floor and yield any remaining time I might have. I think I might have had an hour, is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Michigan). The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) had 30 minutes, of which he had approximately 13 minutes remaining. The balance of the Majority Leader's hour can be controlled by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

THE TIME IS RIGHT FOR PRAYER IN OUR SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 43 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

I wanted to say to the gentleman from North Carolina, I was debating one of the school prayer debates that we have so often here in Washington with a gentleman named Barry Lynn who allegedly is a preacher, but one of these preachers who has no church. He heads a group called Americans for Separation of the Church and State, not exactly a grass-roots organization; I think a top-down Washington elitist kind of organization, and he is against any form of school prayer.

I said, okay, let us go to Columbine, a horrible tragedy, 12 kids are dead in Colorado. Should the kids in that school be allowed to pray for their fellow students who died? And he said, no. I said, well, should they be allowed to pray immediately when the attack was taking place? There was one group of kids who were clustered, I think, in the back of a biology lab with a teacher. At

that moment, gun shots were going up and down the halls, people were screaming, everybody was terrified. Should they have been allowed to have a corporate prayer, that group of clustered kids together? And he said, no, absolutely not.

Then, the gentleman from North Carolina may remember, months after the Columbine tragedy, the school was replacing the bullet marks that had popped the concrete cinderblocks that are in the hallways of the school, and they were putting 4-by-4 inch tiles and doing them in memory of the students who had died, and I said, should the families be allowed to quote scripture or allude to scripture? And he said, absolutely not.

The point that I am making is so many of these people who are simply trying to say that they are against school prayer are, in fact, far more beyond that. They are anti-Christian, they are theology, they are anti-Semitic. It is not really a matter of: we just want to be fair for everybody and make everybody comfortable. That is not the case at all. They are just very, very mean-spirited, antireligion. So I really appreciate the gentleman from North Carolina for bringing it up.

I want to point out to folks that as the gentleman's father served in Congress, I know that he was here during a period of time when there was a little bit more openness for prayer, so certainly the gentleman brings a perspective of history to the debate.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for a moment, I really appreciate his comments. He has been out front on a number of issues that I think are really important to the foundation of this country.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I do not want to just make my comments about Reverend Barry Lynn or the lady with the PTA, but the children are America's future, and the children have to be given every opportunity. That is the reason I read the paper by the young lady, Ms. Ormand, Rose Ormand from my district, because these are young people. They are America's future leaders. She had those kinds of strong feelings about prayer, and I know that she is just an example of one of millions in this country that feel that they should have the opportunity to have that moment of prayer. So as I said, and then I will yield back, but I am looking forward to the debate next year on the Istook bill, and I know the gentleman from Georgia has been on that bill before. I look forward to joining him.

I was very pleased, I would say to the gentleman from Georgia, when I looked at the vote and about 80-some Democrats voted for the resolution, for which I was pleased, and very pleased that the leader of the minority, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) voted with us on that resolution, so I thought that was progress.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I think that is the case. This has broad bipartisan support. It is a mainstream reflection of America. Certainly there are people on the fringe who maybe want to turn schools into theological institutions. I think that the main reason I send my kids to school, and I know the gentleman does too, I want the basics, reading, writing and arithmetic. It is not up to my schoolteachers to make my children more moral or more spiritual. Then there are other people on the other extreme that do not want any pretense to us. If we look behind us, and I only wish the cameras could show it, but the words in the United States Capitol, 10 feet from where I stand, "In God We Trust," right above the American flag, right above the Speaker pro tempore, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

What do we do every single morning as Democrats and Republicans and Independents and staff members, Federal Government employees, no less, in this House Chamber, we open and always have opened with a prayer, and we have Christian, we have Jewish, we have Muslim, we have whoever Members invite that day to give the opening prayer. So the hypocrisy and the inconsistency is incredible.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Absolutely, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say finally, prior to September 11, 70 percent of Americans surveyed said that they pray regularly. After September 11, 97 percent. America has gotten back down on its knees, and I am glad that we have an administration that acknowledges the role of religion and spiritual matters in their decision-making.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Amen. Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, George Bush has never strayed from that.

In this House since September 11 we have had lots of challenges and the House has moved quickly for a number of reasons to give the President the tools he needs to fight the war and to fight terrorism and to secure the airlines. But the House has consistently done a lot more work than just focusing on the war effort. We support the war effort on a bipartisan basis. We think it is very important to do that. But there are a lot of issues domestically where it is just hard for me to go along with the liberal, big-spending Democrat models that we have seen over the years. I am glad that Speaker HASTERT has been a workhorse. This team in Congress has done a lot of things that unfortunately we cannot get our friends in the other body to do. I will show my colleague a chart of some of the House accomplishments this year.

We passed an energy package. Now what are gas prices doing in North Carolina these days? Are they going down still?

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, they are going down, yes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear that, because when I drive up from Savannah, Georgia, I often have to stop in Lumberton, and they always get about 30 gallons worth for my Suburban. It is very expensive to get gas in North Carolina. In Georgia, it is always a little less. But in Georgia, North Carolina, Washington, D.C., New York City, California, and in Colorado where my mama lives and in Texas where my sister lives, gas prices have come down.

So there are those in the Senate who think, well, okay, we do not need an energy policy anymore, and in California, they have sorted out their situation and they say, let us back off this. But I feel more than ever now that we have got to move towards a comprehensive energy policy.

So we passed on August 2 an energy bill in the House. Where is it now? Well, Mr. DASCHLE does not want to bring it up on the Senate Floor.

□ 2015

We passed July 19 faith-based initiatives, so that we can have charitable groups who deliver welfare services, welfare-to-work, independence-type services, faith-based groups can participate in that. That is actually just broadening the 1996 welfare reform law signed by President Clinton. We passed it over there, and where is it? It has been sitting there for 141 days.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, the two issues the gentleman just mentioned, they were campaign promises by President Bush, as Candidate Bush for the Presidency. He talked about the fact that this country had never developed an energy program plan for America.

As the gentleman made reference, we passed that in the House. That was one of the campaign promises by President George Bush.

Secondly, the faith-based program has met with great excitement in my district in eastern North Carolina, because what Mr. Bush campaigned on was, let us take the assistance, take the service to where the people are, not Washington, D.C., but in Georgia, in North Carolina. Let us let those organizations within the community extend the hand of help. So I just wanted to mention that.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman, that is exactly the way it works. In Savannah, Georgia, we have St. Paul's A.M.E. Church. Reverend Delaney is the minister there, and he has a tremendous ministry. They feed the poor. They have a school program there for young kids. They have outreach to help people who have drug addiction and alcoholism, and need job training.

They are doing all of this, and they cannot compete for any Federal funds,

even though their outcome and the result there shows that Reverend Delaney is effective at this. The reason why is because that recipient, he knows their full name and where they live; he knows their brother, their sister, their mother, their father; he knows their neighborhood; he walks the same streets. He knows them, and he is driven by love for them, not driven by a paycheck.

Yet when he goes to try to get Federal funds to expand his soup kitchen, they say, No, you cannot do that, you are doing too good of a job. You are doing a good job, but you are doing it in the name of religion. We just cannot have that. If faith-based grant programs are driven by results, then what is wrong with letting the Reverend Delaneys of the world take care of the hungry and help, with the Federal Government; not take over it, but help?

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for another moment, I could not agree more. America's strength is its people; and the gentleman, Reverend Delaney that the gentleman just mentioned, obviously is a caring, compassionate man that understands the Bible, to help the brother who is in trouble.

If anything, over the last 20 years, that is why we reformed welfare when we came in 1997. It was simply that the Federal Government does some things good, but a lot of things it does not do so well. So therefore, go back to the community and the people, as the gentleman said, they know the name of the person they are trying to help. That is how government can partnership with local communities and community leaders to do for those who need help.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I think that is so important. The gentleman had mentioned the energy package. There are a whole lot of things that the House has passed that the Senate is sitting on.

I think it is real important to say, hey, we understand that they are now run by the Democrats, and they are going to disagree with the House philosophy. No problem with that. The gentleman came from North Carolina, I came from Georgia, to carry our points of view and our philosophy, and sharpen our ideological swords against opposition, and come up with a better product and a bipartisan product. So we do not expect the Senate to rubber-stamp what the House does, but vote on the things, vote it up or vote it down; have the guts, the integrity, the fortitude to face the American people and say, These are our actions, we are proud of them, and we are right about them.

Now, what is interesting on the energy package, the stumbling block for Mr. DASCHLE happens to be the Alaska National Wildlife Reserve, because he has Democrats who actually want to explore oil there and opportunities, so

he does not have the vote to kill the legislation, so he is going to hold the legislation.

We are a funny country. We do not want to park our Suburbans, we all like our sports utility vehicles, but we do not want to drill oil just anywhere, and we are also tired of buying it from the Middle East. But let us have a sober, adult, mature discussion of ANWR for just a minute.

Just to put it in perspective, if Members can look at this chart, the red outline is the State of Alaska. The blue outline is the State of Texas. The gray outline in the middle of Texas is the State of South Carolina, and the little red dot is the size of the potential drilling area. The wildlife reserve is the size of the State of South Carolina. The little red dot is about 2,000 acres, probably the size of the gentleman's airport. Savannah, Georgia, has an airport about 2,000 acres. That is where it is. That is national security.

Do we have a model for this? As a matter of fact, we do. We have Prudhoe Bay. The same people who were telling us the sky was falling if we explored oil in Prudhoe Bay, now they do not mention the fact that the caribou herd has actually increased, for some reason; and it has not hurt the wildlife.

I am a hunter, an outdoorsman. My constituents love the woods. I do not want to harm the environment, but I also know this.

This summer I was driving up to New York City with my wife and four kids in the car, and I did not even know what State we were in at the time, but we were driving our good old Suburban, and there were five lanes of traffic, two on one side, three on the other, all going one way, so it was a ten-lane interstate.

The car in front of us hits the car in front of it. Another car swings into our lane. Before you know it, we are in the middle of a four-car collision. I do not even know what State we were in. It turned out we were in Delaware. I do not know how Delaware folks like people from Georgia. I was a little nervous and thought they might see the Georgia tag and put an-out-of-state surtax on whatever problem it was.

I am sitting in the middle of these cars whizzing back and forth, trying to get over to the shoulder and get my children out of the car waiting for police, and it turns out that out of the four cars in the collision, one of them was untouched, or not damaged at all. It was our car, our Suburban.

The guy behind us who hit us had about \$2,000 worth of damage. I am not sure if his car was drivable or if he had it towed. The police came and actually did not even fill out a report on us. They filled out a report, but we did not file for any insurance because not one person out of six in our car was hurt, and there was not a scratch on anything.

The point is, why do I want to drive a big car? It is because my children are more important to me, and I do not want to jeopardize their safety. I want to have that option. Because of that, I think it is important to have an abundant fuel supply.

That is why we Americans, when I drive in the car pools Monday and Friday when I am in town, and all it is Ford Expeditions, Suburbans, and other cars; and it is not because we are all going out in the woods in them; it is because of safety and children.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for just a moment, on several points he made, one about the exploration in Alaska, we should remember, and I think the gentleman is a little younger than I am, but we should remember the days of President Jimmy Carter and the lines, and people paying high prices for the gas.

Everybody said then, and I was obviously a much younger person, but everybody was saying then that this country needs to have an energy plan. It needs to have a program, a long-range program. We talked about it and we talked about it, but we never did anything.

So again, I want to go back and give credit to President Bush, because he has taken this on. He said that the American people need to have an energy plan in this country, not just short term but long term. So we did what the President asked us to do and we passed that legislation, as the gentleman said; and it is now languishing over in the Senate. But they will have to deal with that hopefully sooner rather than later. They have waited too long already.

The other point the gentleman was making about his family chose to drive a Suburban. Well, to me, that is what America is about. If I decide I want to drive a small car or a mid-sized car or an SUV, then I should have that right to make that choice and not have the government say, You have to drive a small car. I agree with the gentleman.

Actually, I drive an old 1992 Buick, and I am back and forth every weekend from D.C. to North Carolina and back to D.C. on Monday or Tuesday, whenever we have votes, and that is my choice.

I think if we ever get to a point, and that is why the gentleman and I happen to be Republicans and conservatives, we both are, is that we believe that the American people who pay the taxes, if they decide that they want to drive a car that only gets 15 miles to a gallon, and the gentleman decides he wants to drive a car that gets 28, that is fine. That is what America is about. We should have the choice.

Mr. KINGSTON. It is very important. And I think if the majority leader in the Senate is worried about people actually getting an abundant supply of

gasoline, which apparently he is opposed to, then killing this bill still is not the solution, because there are some other things in here that are very important.

I wanted to talk just a little bit about fuel cell opportunities for automobiles. On Monday in Hinesville, Georgia, I had a great opportunity to go for a ribbon-cutting ceremony for a new business called E-Motion, which makes an electric car using fuel cells. It is a very smart idea.

The concept is that in Hinesville, Georgia, they will start manufacturing a smog-free automobile, so when the gentleman flies to, say, New York City or Atlanta, Georgia, or wherever, he will be able to rent an electric car. He will have a smart car. That car will be tied into a GPS operating system. The gentleman will know where he is going in it. He can return it at the end of the day.

Why is this important? Because we are not saying, let us just keep driving Suburbans forever, let us keep drilling for oil all over the globe. That is not the point at all of the energy package. The energy package is to look at the energy needs from a national security point of view and come up with a combination of what works.

What E-Motion will be doing is using things like fuel cells to help drive automobiles. In California, they have recently passed regulations saying that 22,000 automobiles that are sold that year have to be smog-free. In Europe, they are going to have emission-free zones in certain cities where, unless it is mass transit or a no-smog automobile or an electric car, they will not even be able to drive there.

In Iceland, which is very fossil-fuel dependent on getting fossil fuels in from other countries, they are actually looking at using thermal heat from volcanoes to separate hydrogen from water and use it as an energy source.

So here again, the good old folks in the other body and Mr. DASCHLE are sitting on this technology. That bill, the energy bill that Mr. Bush has pushed, puts millions of dollars into fuel cell research. So this is not just something that is happening in Hinesville, Georgia. This is not something that somebody has to explain. It is something everybody knows, oh, yes, I know what a fuel cell car is. As a matter of fact, I am looking at one right now. They are available in every town.

That is being held up because Mr. DASCHLE is preferring to play up the fears on drilling for oil in Alaska, so he is holding up all these other good things in that energy bill.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. If the gentleman will yield another time, Mr. Speaker, that is what is really somewhat discouraging, when they have that entrepreneurial spirit they have down there with that business in the

gentleman's district, or in Georgia, and there are a multitude of those exciting businesses that could be benefited if we would do our job up here in Washington.

As the gentleman said, the House has done its job; and now it is time for the Senate to move the legislation.

Mr. KINGSTON. The other thing, when we talk about security, obviously we need economic security, we need energy security, we need to have security so our people will be able to spiritually compete in the free enterprise system, but none of it means anything if we do not have a good foreign policy.

I represent Kings Bay, and we have one of the nuclear submarine fleets there. There is a great story of Kika de la Garza, a former Committee on Agriculture chairman. He goes out in the submarine and spends the night. He says to the captain of the sub, How far can you go? And the captain says, As far as we want. He said, When would you turn around? When would you need more gas, more energy for the nuclear generator? He said, We will not. He says, What makes a nuclear sub go back and forth? He said, We run out of food. It is that simple.

Now, in terms of independence and security, what can be more important than an inexpensive, abundant food supply? Yet we passed our farm bill October 5 and the Senate has yet to move on it. And again, hey, agree, disagree, talk to me, let me know how you feel; but nothing has happened.

□ 2030

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. The gentleman is exactly right. Our farmers in eastern North Carolina are like farmers across this Nation. Many of them have been in trouble. The foreign markets have not been what they had hoped they would be, and for a number of reasons the farmers really need this help.

And I want to give the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and all of the Republican and Democrat Members, a lot of credit for the bill they brought to the floor. It was what I thought a very strong, very helpful agricultural farm bill that would help our farmers. And as the gentleman said very well, it has been on the Senate side for quite a few weeks, and now months, and they need to remember that our farmers are waiting for their action.

Mr. KINGSTON. Another thing that ties into the food supply is our trade policy. We have to have a tough trade policy to move our goods around the globe.

A statistic I heard the other day is that in China, if they consumed as much Coca Cola per capita as the country of Australia, Coca Cola could double the size of its company. Now, there are a lot of thirsty Chinese folks over

there who would like to have an opportunity to have a Coca Cola, and a lot of other goods that are made in our country, and trade promotion allows the President of the United States to sit at the bargaining table on these multinational trade agreements and come up with the best deal for American producers and American buyers.

We have passed it in the House, but the Senate is nitpicking it to death. Again, vote on it up or down, send it back to us, amend it, but do not just sit on it.

Another issue: Terrorism reinsurance. Like it or not, a lot of businesses have to have terrorist insurance in order to get loans from banks. Small businesses. But after September 11, traditional insurance companies do not want to provide terrorist coverage.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Michigan). The gentleman will suspend.

Members are to be reminded to refrain from references to Members of the Senate or to characterizations of Senate action or inaction.

Mr. KINGSTON. What happens, the small businesses, in order to get bank loans, cannot get their insurance because they have a terrorist exclusion in the policy. So what we have done in the House, in a responsible manner, is we have said we will help facilitate a reinsurance fund with the large insurance companies, the Travelers, the Aetnas, the Cignas, the CNAs. What we say is, you provide the first \$1 billion in a pool, and then we will set up a reinsurance fund, a buffer above that \$1 billion. We will help underwrite it, but you reimburse the taxpayers.

Of course, we have passed it, and one more time the United States' other body has not moved on it whatsoever. Again, this is about job creation. This is for small businesses.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. If the gentleman will yield for just a moment, I am on the Committee on Financial Services where the legislation came from that the gentleman just made reference to, the insurance issue. In fact, the gentleman sitting in the Chair tonight, who is from Michigan, is also on that committee. The committee worked in a very bipartisan way to come forward with very important legislation that needs to be, and I want to be very careful because of the statement by the Chair, but the Congress as a whole needs to move that legislation soon.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, I agree with the gentleman. Another issue that the House has passed and the United States' other body has not done anything on, is none other than human cloning. We had a very lively debate in July about that. Now, suddenly, there is a company and they have announced they have the ability to clone human tissue. And everybody gets excited and

they say to us, as Members of Congress, what are you guys doing about it? We say, well, we have passed this legislation.

It is our hope that our friends on the other side of the House, on the other side of the United States Capitol, will actually wake up and decide that when they are paid to do a job they will do the job, and that means they will vote and debate legislation on or off the floor. Move it on, vote it up or down, one way or the other. Human cloning might be a good thing.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. If the gentleman will yield for just a moment. There is no question that we always take great pride in the House of Representatives in saying that we are "the people's House." I think anybody in government, whether they are elected or in a professional position, we need to realize that the people of America pay our salaries. And, therefore, if we are responsible for legislative progress, then those of us who are elected to serve in this beautiful Capitol, we need to remember we have a responsibility to do what is right for those people who are our taxpayers. And that means we should work together and we should move legislation expeditiously when we can.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, I thank the gentleman.

Yet another example of something that we have done in the House is we passed an education bill back in May. Again, it is over in that deep dark hole over on the other side of the United States Capitol. An education bill. That was George Bush's top priority, and we passed it. Again, it has been sitting floundering, waiting. And, hey, no call, no letter, no anything.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) has said we may be able to get the education bill out maybe Thursday, maybe Friday, maybe even next week, and I think that we all want to do that. But we are excited.

A patients' bill of rights, which we passed back in August. Again, it has been sitting over there in the morgue, also known as the other body.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Well, I certainly want to be careful, because of the ruling of the Chair, but I often think about the gentleman from Georgia and other of my colleagues, especially those that live much further than that, particularly our colleagues on both sides of the fence that live out west, because I can drive home in 5 hours from Washington. And I think the difference in why we are so responsive is because we see the people we have the privilege to represent just about every weekend. We are here for 2 years and then we run for reelection. As it is set up by the Constitution, the other side of the Capitol, they are there for 6 years.

Now, I am not advocating that they should serve for 2 years, but I am just

saying that we are much more in tune with the people we represent than the other body.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, again, actions by the House on energy bill, faith-based initiatives, farm bill, trade promotion bill, appropriation bills, terrorist reinsurance plan, human cloning, education, and a patients' bill of rights, and we are still waiting for them to come back around.

I do want to talk about the economic security bill, because in my area of Georgia, a big tourist area, tourism is down. Amongst retirees, their stock portfolios, their retirement programs have shrunk considerably. Down the street people are laid off. A friend of mine who has two children was laid off recently. Lots of people are losing their jobs.

We passed an economic security package in October. And I do not know, the Speaker will have to help guide me, because I have this quote here and it says that the leader of the other body, Mr. DASCHLE, said that "It is not as front-burner an issue as other legislation, particularly government spending." And that is from the Associated Press, October 27.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Members are reminded that remarks in debate may not include personal references to, or quotations of, Members of the Senate.

Mr. KINGSTON. Okay, Mr. Speaker, and I will not use this one again. However, it does show a particular philosophy of a body that wants to spend money rather than a body that wants to preserve and protect jobs.

And I think if maybe there is a real difference between being a Democrat and being a Republican that is reflected in the Republicans running the House and the Democrats running the other body, it is in the economic security bill. Because here we are standing strong with jobs, standing strong with laid-off workers for benefits, for health care benefits and for unemployment checks, and yet this other body, controlled by the other party, is sitting on it and saying we would rather you do spending bills than an economic stimulus package. I think that is egregious and totally irresponsible in today's economy.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I really agree with the gentleman. I came to the Congress with Mr. Newt Gingrich in the 1994 election, sworn in in 1995, and we have believed ever since we have been in the majority that the people that worked hard in this country, awfully hard for their money, should keep the majority of their money.

And, in addition, as the gentleman said, those people who have been laid off work, if we can help strengthen business, small, midsize and large, so that they can get some tax breaks so

that then they will be willing to expand job opportunities, that is what America is all about. That is our philosophy, to empower the people, empower the businesses so that the economy is moving and the engine is pumping.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, again, I understand a difference in philosophy. I have a lot of friends in the other party who did not like the economic security bill. Maybe they did not like particular parts of it, maybe they ultimately voted against it. But to their credit they engaged in the debate. They came down on the floor and they voted. Whereas in the other body it appears that the best action is total inaction, and that is tragic. There are too many people who have worked hard on a package to try to jump-start this economy, but we need to have it.

I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, if I can talk about appropriation bills or not.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Members are reminded to refrain from references to Members of the Senate or to characterizations of Senate action or inaction.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman. I stand corrected. And I want to commend the freshman sitting in the Chair for his very careful and thorough job tonight, and being patient with frustrated Members like me.

We have had a very productive year on the House side of the branch of the legislature, and we just hate to go home, at Christmas time nearly, and do it incompletely when there is an opportunity still to pass so many great pieces of legislation that will help real people in the real world get jobs, get jobs back, get benefits, secure benefits that they have, obtain a good food supply, good energy supply, and an education program that works.

There are just so many things that are within our legislative grasp to do something about, and it is so frustrating to have only part of that done. There is just one area in the legislative branch where there seems to be a gap. We have the executive branch all ready with the ink pen full of ink ready to sign the legislation to get America moving again.

We have worked hard here, Democrats and Republicans alike on the House side. We have had great leadership under the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), and the recently-announced retiree, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), even though that will not be for a year from now. And of course the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

So many great things. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG),

chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who I do not think has been home since August in terms of working overtime to try to get these appropriation bills passed. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) of the Committee on Ways and Means moving on trade and health care bills and so forth.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Well, I know we are getting close to the closing, and I am going to leave in just a second, but I have really enjoyed being with the gentleman, and I think he has done a great service really not only for his district but for the American people.

There is one thing about it, and the gentleman might be somewhat restricted as to his statements tonight, but there is one thing about it, and I am sure the gentleman has, as I have, a lot of speaking opportunities back in his district, and I am proud to tell those people in my district what we in the House have done. And in that forum, you can certainly call names and you can make references to what has or has not happened.

So I want to thank the gentleman. He helped me with my time talking about school prayer. I appreciate the gentleman's friendship, his leadership, and thank him for allowing me to be a small part of this tonight.

□ 2045

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

ANTIBALLISTIC MISSILE TREATY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Michigan). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this evening, there are two subjects I want to focus my attention to. One is especially parochial to the State of Colorado, and especially important to me in regards to the State of Colorado, but it is parochial.

The other issue I want to talk about is of national interest, and it is not parochial. In fact, it is something that is vitally important for every citizen of America. It is a subject of which we will see lots of publicity in the upcoming days. It is a subject of which this House, each and every one of us, needs to stand up and support our President on the position that he is going to take, and that is on missile defense. I want to go through this evening the importance of missile defense, exactly what the anti-ballistic missile treaty is all about, the age of the treaty, and what the extraordinary circumstances are that now threaten the security interests of the United States of America, as well as allies of the United States of America; and I would include within those comments Russia.